

REMARKS

Claims 21-25 presently stand rejected. Independent claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schleppenbach (Publication Number 2005/0069842). Claims 22-25, which depend from claim 21, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite "said monolithic Braille cell cap comprising a top plate and a plurality of side walls such that the side walls are approximately perpendicularly connected to the top plate." Schleppenbach does not disclose or describe at least this claim limitation. Similarly, claim 21 has been amended to explain that the monolithic cell cap of the present invention encases the cell pins.

Schleppenbach discloses a top plate member **22** of a Braille cell cap, wherein the top plate member **22** is secured over upstanding pins **34** (note Fig. 2). The top plate member **22** is connected to a midplate member **26** and a circuit board **28** by way of fasteners **26**. *See* Figs. 1 and 2; Paragraph 0036. Unlike the present invention, Schleppenbach does not disclose a monolithic Braille cap that encases the Braille cell pins. Rather, Schleppenbach discloses placing a sheet, the top plate member **22**, over the cell pins. The monolithic cell cap of the present invention, however, encases the cell pins, so that the pins are more protected. Accordingly, because claim 21 requires encasing the cell pins, as opposed to just covering them such as in Schleppenbach, claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 22-25, which are dependent on claim 21, and thus incorporate the above inventive limitation, are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite because claim 22 recited that the plurality of buttons and first comb-like holder for the plurality of buttons comprised the Braille cell cap, as opposed to the Braille cell assembly. Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to recite the Braille cell assembly in the preamble, as opposed to the Braille cell cap. It is thus believed that claims 22-25, as

amended, have overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claim 26 has been added, and is believed to be allowable in scope over Schleppenbach.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required at any time during the prosecution of this application without specific authorization, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1667.

By: Michael J. Colitz, III
Michael J. Colitz, III
Registration No. 37,010
Holland & Knight LLP
Suite 4100
100 North Tampa Street
Tampa, Florida 33602-3644
Telephone: 813/227-8500
Facsimile: 813/229-0134

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Amendment A was placed in an envelope and mailed via U.S. Express Mail, postage prepaid to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this the 6th day of July, 2007.

Michael J. Colitz, III
Michael J. Colitz, III